UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,620	02/05/2004	Ronald Richard Rayburn	20714-0027	5081
	7590 09/10/2007 LLACE & NURICK LLC	•	EXAM	INER
100 PINE ST.			HARTMAN JR, RONALD D	
P.O. BOX 1166 HARRISBURG	6, PA 17108-1166		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
	,	•	2121	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			41
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	*
	10/772,620	RAYBURN ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ronald D. Hartman Jr.	2121	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	ss
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this committee (35 U.S.C. § 133).	, ,
Status	•		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Fe	ebruary 2004.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar			erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-26 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1 Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Sta	ge
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/772,620

Art Unit: 2121

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 4 recites, "for the instant message identifier of the at least one remotely located interface", but claims 2 and 3 recite an identifier for the user and for the router. There is insufficient antecedent basis for an identifier for the remotely located interface.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 7, "wherein the step of packetizing the data" lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6-9, 12-13, 16-18, 20-21 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stead et al., U.S. Patent No. 2002/0002627.

As per claim 1, Stead et al. teaches a method of remotely monitoring building equipment comprising the steps of: providing at least one item of building equipment (e.g. Figure 2 elements 90) communicably linked to a router (e.g. Figure 2 elements 80), the router being communicably linked to an instant messaging server (e.g. interpreted to correspond to Figure 2 element 30; Also see [0009], [0018] and [0061]); providing at least one remotely located interface (e.g. Figure 2 element 10), the at least one

Art Unit: 2121

remotely located interface being communicably linked to the instant messaging server; gathering data from the at least one item of building equipment with the router; and transmitting the data from the router to the at least one remotely located interface in an instant message through the instant messaging server (e.g. [0012]).

As per claims 6-9, packetizing data into data packets and encapsulating a data packet into an instant message by converting the data prior to encapsulation, and unencapsulating the encapsulated data packet at a remote interface are features inherent to Stead et al. and the use of Internet Protocols for remotely monitoring building equipment via instant messages.

As per claims 12 and 21, Stead et al. further teaches gathering operational status data, operational parameters and historical parameters (e.g. [0012]).

As per claims 13 and 20, Stead et al further teaches the building equipment being heating equipment (e.g. [0012]).

As per claims 16-17 and 24-26, the features claimed are believed to be inherent to the overall functions and or operations of Stead et al.'s disclosed building equipment monitor and control system. That is, gathering data regarding the state of the equipment in response to a user request for that information appears to be anticipated by Stead et al. Furthermore, packetizing and encapsulation, as already explained with reference to pending claims 6-9 (their rejection applied herein), are feature believed to be inherent to Stead et al. and the use of Internet Protocols for remotely monitoring building equipment via instant messages.

As per claim 18, the rejection of claims 1 and 6-9 are applied herein.

Application/Control Number: 10/772,620

Art Unit: 2121

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 14-15, 19 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stead et al., as applied to claims 1 and 18, from above, in view of Official Notice.

As per claims 2-5 and 19, Official Notice is taken with respect to a feature of assigning a name or number to a router, to a feature of assigning an identifier of a user, and a feature wherein the identifiers are used to check authorization of a user so that only authorized users access the building equipment. The incorporation of these well-known security features would provide for a mechanism by which unauthorized users are prevented from accessing and changing the operations of the building equipment, and this would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stead et al., as applied to claims 13 and 21, from above, in view of Official Notice.

As per claims 14 and 22, Official Notice is taken with respect to a feature wherein a temperature, or thermostat setting, is a parameter that is monitored and controlled remotely via the Internet or other wide area network.

It would have been obvious to include this feature for the purpose of allowing the temperature of a building to be remotely monitored and controlled via the Internet, thereby allowing a user the ability to monitor and change the temperature of the building from practically any location anywhere in the world.

Art Unit: 2121

As per claims 15 and 23, Official Notice is taken with respect to polling as it represents a well-known feature of building monitor and control systems. Its incorporation would have been obvious for the purpose of allowing the system, and specific parts thereof, to be monitored at specific times, thereby reducing the need for the building to be monitored continuously.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 10-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As per claims 10-11, specifically dependent claim 10, the prior art of record fails to disclose a method of remotely monitoring building equipment wherein each item of building equipment is assigned an address to permit electronic identification of the equipment, in combination with the other claimed features. In other words, every piece of equipment in a building is assigned an address that is used to permit electronic identification of each piece of equipment of the building.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald D. Hartman Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3684. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 11:00 - 8:30 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 2121

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronald D Hartman Jr.

Patent Examiner

R.D. Hotel

Art Unit 2121

August 28, 2007

RDH

XROH